NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

DEC 13 2019

MOLLY C. DWYER, CLERK
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

JONATHAN AMBROSE VANLOAN, Plaintiff-Appellant, v. NATION OF ISLAM; et al., Defendants-Appellees.	No. 18-16813 D.C. No. 4:18-cv-00226-DTF MEMORANDUM*

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the District of Arizona
Raner C. Collins, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted December 11, 2019**

Before: WALLACE, CANBY, and TASHIMA, Circuit Judges.

Jonathan Ambrose VanLoan appeals pro se from the district court's judgment dismissing his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action alleging federal and state claims. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291. We review de novo a district court's dismissal for lack of subject matter jurisdiction. *Bishop Paiute Tribe v. Inyo Cty.*,

* This disposition is not appropriate for publication and is not precedent except as provided by Ninth Circuit Rule 36-3.

** The panel unanimously concludes this case is suitable for decision without oral argument. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2).

863 F.3d 1144, 1151 (9th Cir. 2017). We affirm.

The district court properly dismissed VanLoan's action because VanLoan's claims are too frivolous and unsubstantial to invoke subject matter jurisdiction. *See Hagans v. Lavine*, 415 U.S. 528, 536 (1974) ("Over the years this Court has repeatedly held that the federal courts are without power to entertain claims otherwise within their jurisdiction if they are so attenuated and unsubstantial as to be absolutely devoid of merit . . . ."); *Franklin v. Murphy*, 745 F.2d 1221, 1227 n.6 (9th Cir. 1984) ("A paid complaint that is 'obviously frivolous' does not confer federal subject matter jurisdiction[.]").

AFFIRMED.